

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are presently pending.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-9 "under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections." More specifically, the Examiner states that "[t]he omitted structural cooperative relationships are: the relationship between the column and each of the other structural elements of the claim, and specifically the relationship between the column and the piston and piston rod, and the relationship between the column and the claw bush. Lacking such essential structural cooperative relationship, the claim recitation 'corresponding to an end of the piston rod and/or to an end of the column' is indefinite."

Independent Claims 1 and 6-8 have been amended to overcome this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Specifically, the claims have been amended to recite that the column is also disposed in the claw bush adjacent, *i.e.*, near, the piston rod. Support for these limitations is found at least at page 3, line 22 through page 4, line 21 and FIGS. 1-4 of the originally filed specification. No new matter has been added. It is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been overcome.

The Examiner also states that "in claim 7, line 6, 'the column' lacks proper antecedent basis in the claim, since the preamble lacks even a mention of the column (and clearly does not provide the structural cooperative relationship between the column and the other structural elements of the apparatus)."

Claim 7 has further been amended to recite that the interlock further comprises "a column" to provide antecedent basis therefor.

Accordingly, it is believed that this rejection has also been overcome.

Finally, the Examiner states that Claims 1-9 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office Action.

The Examiner is thanked for the provisional allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By Erik L. Ence
Erik L. Ence
Registration No. 42,511
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated: January 7, 2004